

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE. THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST

No. 393.

Official Organ of the Australasian
Socialist Party.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10th, 1917.

Registered at the General Post Office, Sydney,
for transmission by post as a Newspaper.

Price: One Penny

The Axe to the Root.

By the Late James Connolly.

(Continued.)

A CONSTRUCTIVE COMMON-WEALTH.

Now, having grasped the idea that the administrative power of the Socialist Republic of the future will function through national, industrially organised, and the principle of democratic control will operate through the workers' congresses, and that the present, territorial State of capitalist society will have no place in the future, we must consider the Socialist Party, whose programme states that "Socialist theory demands that of a Socialist Party, as well as the national congress, the Socialist Party must be a party of the future."

So, in the first place, the Socialist Party is a party of the future, and its programme is a programme of the future. The various measures, against the evils of capitalist society, brought forward by us in connection with the Socialist Party, are not measures of the future, but measures of the present. As we have shown, the political State of capitalism has no place under Socialism, therefore measures which aim to place industries in the hands of or under the control of such a political State are in no sense steps towards that ideal; they are but useful measures to restrict the greed of capitalism and to familiarise the workers with the conception of common ownership. This latter is, indeed, their chief function. But the enslavement of the workers in unions patterned closely after the structure of modern industries, and following the organic lines of industrial development, is a step towards the swift, earnest and necessary socialisation of our industry, and is the Socialist Party's programme. It prepares a solid framework of capitalist society, the working forms of the Socialist Republic, and thus, while increasing the resisting power of the workers against present encroachments of the capitalist class, it familiarises him with the idea that the union he is helping to build up is destined to supplant that class in the control of the industry in which he is employed.

Emancipatory Unionism.

The power of this idea to transform the dry, dead work of trade union organisation into the constructive work of revolutionary Socialism, and thus to make of the unimaginative trade unionist a potent factor in the launching of a new system of society, cannot be over-estimated. It invests the social details of the daily incidents of the class struggle with a new and beautiful meaning, and presents them in their true light as skirmishes between the two opposing armies of light and darkness. In the light of this principle of Industrial Unionism, every fresh shop or factory organised under its banner is a fort wrestled from the control of the capitalist class and manned with the soldiers of the Revolution, to be held by them for the workers. On the day that the political and economic forces of labor finally break with capitalist society, and proclaim the Workers' Republic, these shops and factories, so manned by Industrial Unionists, will be taken charge of by the workers there employed, and force and effectiveness thus given to that proclamation. Then, and thus, the new society will spring into existence, ready equipped to perform all the useful functions of its predecessor.

The Future of Labor.

In choosing for the subject of this

chapter such a title as "The Future of Labor," I am aware that I run the risk of arousing expectations that I shall not be able to satisfy. The future of labor is a subject with which is bound up the future of civilisation, and, therefore, a comprehensive treatment of the subject might be interpreted as demanding an analysis of all the forces and factors which will influence humanity in the future, and also their resultant effect.

Needless to say, my theme is a less ambitious one. I propose simply to deal with the problem of labor in the immediate future, with the marshalling of labor for the great conflict that confronts us, and with a consideration of the steps to be taken in order that the work of aiding the transition from Industrial Slavery to Industrial Freedom might be, as far as possible, freed from all encumbering and needless obstacles and expense of time, energy and money.

Bondage to Freedom.

But, first, and as an aid to a proper understanding of my position, let me place briefly before you my reading of the history of the past struggles of mankind against social subjection, my reading of the mental development undergone by each revolting class in the different stages of their struggle, from the first period of their bondage to the first dawn of their freedom. As I view it, such struggles had three well-marked mental stages, corresponding to the inception, development, and decay of the oppressing powers, and as I intend to attempt to apply this theory to the position of labor as a subject class to-day, I hope you will honor me by at least giving me your earnest attention to this conception, and aid by your discussion in determining at which of these periods or stages the working class, the subject class of to-day, has arrived. My reading, then, briefly is this: That, in the first period of bondage, the eyes of the subject class are always turned towards the past and all its efforts in revolt are directed to the end of destroying the social system, in order that it might march backward and re-establish the social order of ancient times—"the good old days." That the goodness of those days was largely hypothetical seldom enters the imagination of men on such awkwardly.

In the second period, the subject class tends more and more to lose sight and recollection of any pre-existent state of society, to believe that the social order in which it finds itself always did exist, and to bend all its energies to obtaining such ameliorations of its lot within existent society as will make that lot more bearable. At this stage of society the subject class, as far as its own aspirations are concerned, may be reckoned as a conservative force.

In the third period, the subject class becomes revolutionary, recks little of the past for inspiration, but, building itself upon the achievements of the present, confidently addresses itself to the conquest of the future. It does so because the development of the framework of society has revealed to it its relative importance, revealed to it the fact that within its grasp has grown, unconsciously to itself, a power which, if intelligently applied, is sufficient to overcome and master society at large.

The Peasant Revolts.

As a classic illustration of this conception of the history of the mental development of the revolt against social oppression, we might glance at the many peasant revolts recorded in European history. As we are now aware, common ownership of land was at one time the basis of society all over the world. Our fathers not only owned their land in common, but in many ways practised a common ownership of the things produced. In short, tribal communism was, at one time, the universally existent order. In such a state of society there existed a degree of freedom that no succeeding order has been able to parallel, and that none will be able to until the individualistic order of to-day gives way to the Industrial Commonwealth, the Workers' Republic of the future. How that ancient order broke up it is no part of my task to tell. What I do wish to draw your attention to is that, for hundreds of, for a thousand, years after the break-up of that tribal communism, and the reduction to serfdom of the descendants of the formerly free tribesmen, all the efforts of the revolting serfs were directed to a destruction of the new order of things, and to a rehabilitation of the old. Take, as an example, the various peasant wars of Germany, the Jacquerie of France, or the revolt of Wat Tyler and John Ball in England as being the best known; examine their rude literature in such fragments as have been preserved, study their speeches as they have been recorded, even by their enemies, read the translations of their songs, and in all of them you will find a passionate harking back to the past, a morbid idealising of the status of their fathers, and a continued exhortation to the suffering people to destroy the present, in order that, in some vague and undefined manner, they might reconstitute the old.

Coming of Capitalism.

The defeat of the peasantry left the stage clear for the emergence of the bourgeoisie as the most important subject class, and for the development of that second period of which I have spoken. Did it develop? Well, in every account we read of the conflicts between the nobility and the burghers in their guilds and cities, we find that the aggressive part was always taken by the former, and that, wherever a revolt took place, the revolting guild merchants and artisans justified their act by an appeal to the past privileges which had been abrogated, and the restoration of which formed the basis of their claims, and their only desire if successful in revolt. One of the most curious illustrations of this mental condition is to be found in the "History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic," by Motley, in which that painstaking historian tells how the Netherlands, in their revolt against the Spanish Emperor, continued for a generation to base their claims upon the political status of the provinces under a former Emperor, made war upon the Empire with troops levied in the name of the Emperor, and led by officers whose commissions were made out by the rebel provinces in the name of the sovereign they were fighting against. This mental condition lasted in England until the great Civil War, which ended by leaving Charles I. without a head, and the bourgeoisie, incarnated in Cromwell, firmly fixed in the saddle; in France, it lasted till the Revolution. In both countries it was abandoned, not because of any priori reasoning upon its absurdity, nor because some great thinker had evolved a better scheme, but because the growth of the industrial system had made the capitalist class realise that they could at any moment stop the flow of its life-blood, so to speak, and, from so realising, it was but a short mental evolution to frame a theory of political action which proclaimed that the capitalist class was the nation, and all its enemies the enemies of the nation at large. The last period of that social evolution had been reached, the last mental stage of the transition from feudal ownership to capitalist property.

(Continued Next Issue.)

The receipt of a copy of this paper is an invitation to become a subscriber.

The W. E. A.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM OUR MELBOURNE BRANCH.

Australian Socialist Party,
Melbourne Branch, 47 Victoria
Street, City.

Mr. J. B. Claringbold,
Hon. Sec., W.E.A.

Dear Sir,—I regret delay in answering your letter of 11.9.17, which was unavoidable. You miss altogether the point of this Branch's contention, viz. that no education from Primary to University can be of any use or advantage to the working class, unless it is based on consciousness of the class struggle.

"To attack the present system of education," as you say, "and to change the objective to developing the individual mind," is a mere waste of time, if the individual mind is to be trained as a unit of the Capitalist System.

Our contention is, that education or training in scientific and industrial efficiency is of value only to the working class, provided that these so trained receive the full product of their labor, mentally and industrially.

Under the present system of Capitalism, the Capitalists who own the workshops and the jobs therein reap the advantage in having a large supply of well trained wage slaves to exploit, and from whom to extract profits. It is true, as you say, that 99 per cent. of the people are subjects of prejudices imposed on them during childhood. For this reason, where the Capitalist State in any country imposes a system of education on the working class, the latter are educated, not in, or for, their own interests, but in those of the Master Class.

More than ever is this great danger apparent. It lies in diverting a large portion of the educational period of the youth to manual training, and away from mental culture; and for this reason Socialists recognise that with the spread of industrial training in the schools they will have to strive for further extension of education in other directions for their Class, i.e., the best the University can bestow.

Truly has it been said by a Socialist writer: "With the centralisation of power which inevitably accompanies the higher development of the Capitalist system, the schools are becoming more and more merely the instruments of the Top Capitalist Class, used largely for moulding the youth in conformity with the Industrial Autocracy which rules the nation to-day."

If the W.E.A. were based on education of the Working Class from Primary to University, on class-consciousness lines, with a view to the Working Class receiving scientific education and technical training, and owning all they produce, then, surely, this Organisation would affiliate. As at present constituted the W.E.A. is one in name only.

On your own showing, the W.E.A. is a mixture of Bourgeoisie and Proletariat; the latter entirely class unconscious, as for example, 24 trades union representatives, who should not be divided against each other in petty craft unions, but organised into ONE BIG INDUSTRIAL UNION with others of their class.

And the A.N.A. is a bourgeois outfit containing some of the most conservative and reactionary individuals in the Commonwealth—the present Premier of Victoria, for example, and Mr. W. Watt, M.H.R.—both of whom are opposed to the interests of the Working Class.

Far from this Branch's "deduction" being contrary to facts, to quote your letter, their deduction is correct from the only basis possible to them.

With other scientific Socialists they ask of all educational systems, "Are these of benefit to the Working Class in aiding them to overthrow the Capitalist system, and to introduce Social ownership with full control of the Instruments of Production of and Distribution? If not, THEY ARE OF NO USE TO THE WORKING CLASS."

On behalf of the Executive,
R. AARONS, Hon. Sec.

THE MITCHELL LIBRARY

28 NOV. 1917

THE
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST.OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AUSTRALASIAN
SOCIALIST PARTY.SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Australia, 4/- per
year; 1/- per quarter. Postage added to
other countries.ORDERS FOR PAPERS to be sent to the
Press Committee, 115 Goulburn Street,
Sydney.

MATTER FOR PUBLICATION.

All articles and matter for publication must
be addressed to the "Press Committee" and
accompanied by the name and address of the
writer (not necessarily for publication).Write on one side of the paper only, and be
sure to write in ink.Rejected manuscript will be returned if
stamps are enclosed for that purpose.

WHEN YOUR SUBSCRIPTION IS DUE.

Every subscriber will be notified by circular
when his subscription runs out. The number
of the last issue to be posted will be indicated.Some Leaders of the
Blind.RECOLLECTIONS OF TRADE UNION
TREACHERY.

(By F. SUTHERLAND)

Happening to pick up a copy of a British publication "Tit Bits" dated 23rd. June last, I observed a par, in the "Over-seas London Letter" written by "a London Clubman," which says in part, "The recent visit of popular Will Thorne to Buckingham Palace, to tell the King of his experiences in Russia is another instance of His Majesty's determination to obtain first hand information of all that concerns the war."—And the par ends thus—"The King is getting to know most of the Labor leaders for both Mr. Barnes the new member of War Cabinet and Mr. Hodge, were guests at Windsor recently."

What a hurricane of recollections of Trade Union treachery and infidelity to the working class by leaders, parliamentarians and alleged Socialists, a par like the above calls up to one who has noticed some of those goings on in England in his time. Will Thorne a Labor member, and presumably a Democrat and therefore logically a Republican and if consistent having pronounced leanings towards Socialism, goes to Russia, one would suppose at least to advance the interests of democracy and help establish a Republic. On his return to England, King George no doubt also anxious to see a Republican administration in Russia, grants an audience to the "popular" Will Thorne. Also the King is getting acquainted with other Labor members because of his consuming love for democracy and democratic institutions; particularly those of Republican countries.

Labor has secured royal patronage, and all is for the best. The Allies are fighting for democracy, liberty, etc., and etc. The fact is, however,

He and others like him went there solely to arrange that Russia should keep on fighting; utterly regardless as to whether the country remained a Monarchy or became a Republic. It was his success in the mission of the united class and their interests, that made him so interesting to Royalty.

It was in fear of offending "the quality," and with a view to nursing the innate conservatism of the British working man that Will Thorne declared definitely, in a speech at Silvertown in 1910, that he was not a Socialist. About the same time the London "Daily Chronicle" says Thorne had the support of "ministers of religion of employers of labour of tradesmen and of all classes." A man having the support "of all classes" is of little use to the working class, and in a fit state of mind for a royal interview. But in order that he may be confirmed in his treachery with regard to working class interests, it is necessary to play upon his vanity by bestowing upon him royal and

aristocratic patronage.

Most people in England know of the decline and fall of John Burns. As an organizer of the London Dockers' strike and a Trafalgar square orator, in the eighties he was known as a friend of Labor, and capitalist papers hailed him as a demagogue. Elected to the London County Council he chummed with Lord Roseberry, and mental dry rot ensued as a result. This spread rapidly, urged on by the well known conceit of the man, and was confirmed by a visit to royalty. Thereafter exit John Burns. Had he been less conceited he might have helped the capitalist class to a greater extent than he has done. Recognising this the London "Observer," 15th March, 1908, said—"Mr. Burns may play a strong role in the national struggle against Socialism, and we like his unstooping courage. But he does the part of Boanerges belligerent. We do not want him to lose his influence over the masses. We want him to retain it; but unless he modifies his later manner his words will carry less weight with the masses than those of any man in England. Once that is seen his present popularity with plutocrats will fail. These are not pleasant things to say, but they must be said if the President of the Local Government Board is to be prevented from spoiling his career by excess of temperament."

There you have it—the ruling class rather overdid it—they laid the flattery on with a trowel, and Burns imagined himself in the seventh heaven of capitalist paradise. Hence we find him defending Asquith and his Government in the Featherstone shooting of miners in 1893, and in his ridiculous statements that any one wanting work could get it; and that temperance and thrift were what the workers required to practice, and all would be well.

Another worthy who lately visited these Austral shores is Victor Grayson. His calibre can be gauged when in debate with Mr. Joynton Hicks in 1908 he said—"It would have given me pleasure in to-night's debate had Mr. Joynton Hicks, instead of reading the esoteric philosophical ramblings of the philosopher, Mr. Belford Bax, instead of going to the exotics of Karl Marx, if he had come to the source of English Socialism, the books of the English economists to learn what the Socialist suggestion really is." What he means by "English Socialism," may be realised when he called Lloyd George a Socialist after the introduction of his much talked of Budget in 1912.

Grayson also "counts the existence of God as part of his life and aspirations." I wonder if the war reminds him of that once illustrious personage—called the Devil—or is it as Martineau once said to a man who was defending Jehovah, the Jewish God, and Number One of the Christian Trinity, "Your God is my devil." As the "Socialist Standard," to whom I am indebted for much of this information, says: "He (Grayson) is a man who has no very clear idea of where he stands upon questions of economics; who certainly does not understand the Socialist position, and who cannot, therefore, be accepted as in any adequate sense a representative of Socialism. He is, we should say, a product of clarionism. Clarionism being compact of sentiment and snobbery, with a strong infusion of capitalist "progressive" ideas and a mild dash of Socialist thought."

This brings us, by virtue of the association of ideas, to Blatchford; who is the champion decoy duck of capitalism; the Literary War Lord of British Jingoism.

Of course, Blatchford has no time for Marx, and he says in "Fortnightly Review," Feb. 1908—"Dr. Crozier is mistaken if he thinks I take my Socialism from Marx or that it depends upon the Marxian theory of value. I have never read a line of Marx. English Socialism is not German, it is English. English Socialism is not Marxian, it is humanitarian." It would surprise him to know that Marx illustrated his theories by examples from capitalism in England, it being the leading capitalist country of that day, as the United States is in our day. And to talk of Socialism being humanitarian, is as if one should talk of biology or psychology as humane or inhumane, when it is merely a relation of facts as they are. Nature itself is not humane. Like Grayson, he wishes to be respectful to Deity, as this is fashionable. His statements in "God and my Neighbour" did not apparently prohibit him from writing in the magazine aforementioned—"All forms of human genius, like land and water and the fruits of the earth, are the gifts of God, and why should not we bring all of us God's chil-

dren, share the gifts of our Father to the comfort and happiness of us all." As is usual with other misleaders so with Blatchford, it is only when they speak of royalty, of the temporary gods or josses of the aristocracy, that he gives free rein to servile sentiment. On the death of King Edward, Blatchford wrote as follows: "I may say now what I could not say before; that when I said the nation 'needed a man, I was thinking of the king. I felt that the king could save the situation, and avert the danger. He had the love and confidence of the Empire. He had but to speak and the Empire would have been safe. When I heard that the king was dead, I knew that the one man who could move us all had fallen for ever silent." Probably the Hindoos, the Egyptians, the French Canadians and Irish are not included in the "love and confidence" racket for obvious reasons.

To cancel this fulsome flattery we take this passage from the biography of King Edward, by Sir Sydney See, who says—"King Edward cannot be credited with the greatness that comes of statesmanship and makes for the moulding of history. Neither the constitutional checks on his power nor his discursive tastes and training left him much opportunity for influencing political affairs. No originating faculty can be assigned to him. For the most part, he stood with constitutional correctness aloof from the political arena at home. On questions involving large principles he held no very definite views. He preferred things to remain as they were. A man of the world, he lacked the intellectual equipment of a thinker, and showed on occasion an unwillingness to exert his mental powers."

So Blatchford's great man becomes a very ordinary, everyday specimen indeed.

If "German Socialism" is not agreeable to alleged Socialists, German Royalists and German religion is so apparently. The House of Stuart was altogether too lively—not sedate enough to suit the English temperament. Englishmen used to say to me: "King Edward was a very goodnatured and agreeable man," and I used to ask them are goodnatured and agreeable men as scarce in England that they are worth hundreds of thousands per annum to keep them in the country. The fact is British sentiment is thoroughly corrupted, and made flabby and sentimental, by the all pervading influence of an enormous number of wealthy people, who are made unduly conspicuous by a dark background of the most hopeless and degrading poverty the world has ever seen. Snobbery and wealth worship abound; the devotees riot in extravagant language as subjects do when paying respects to Oriental potentates; so fulsome and insincere is the adulation that sensible seions of Royalty are themselves disgusted with the exhibitions of insincerity they are forced to witness. As in Israel of old, so in England to-day; the Golden Calf is almost everywhere worshipped.

Lately Ben Tillett has been exhorting "our boys" in France, and incidentally called upon joss like any other modern savage. Tillett tried to introduce Australian reactionary legislation in England, by advocating compulsory arbitration; and acted as emigration agent or tout for the Queensland Government, in their efforts to get emigrants in a time of drought and industrial depressions.

Then we have another "gusher," Will Crook (beg pardon, Crooks). Speaking at the Browning Settlement at Walworth a few years ago, Crooks said, speaking of the king—"I am one of those men who perhaps know more intimately than the majority of my people something about the king. I feel and know from the bottom of my heart he is the greatest statesman the world possesses at this moment. (Applause.) The peace of the world in his hands is perfectly sure. I have seen, I have witnessed, I have asked others to bear witness to the fact that in these days of courtiers when everybody who is anybody, says, "Stand back for the king," he has always been ready to say, "Stand aside and let the people see." One instance of this I witnessed. A great gentleman was introduced to the king. He walked up in a way that I am told people are trained to do. (Laughter.) They say it is a gift. (Laughter.) You can't do it. (Laughter.) The next man was a mechanic, but he did not know how to approach the king. The king immediately he saw his embarrassment, rushed out to shake hands with him. (Cheers.) He always makes the poor man feel as comfortable as possible. He is above Tory, above Liberal, above Socialist. He is, in fact, the father of us all, who smiles at us and loves to see us fighting in our way. We cannot have the king in any controversy. We like to feel that he is above

all and to look up to him." No wonder the speech was punctuated with laughter, for it was a screaming farce. But then he was speaking to an English audience of whom Meredith says—"Unimpressible English, who won't believe in the existence of aims that don't drop on the ground before your eyes and squat and stare at you." They like to listen to Crook platitudes and banalities like the above servile eulogium. We are not devoid of that weakness in Australia.

When Fisher and Mrs. Fisher were granted royal audience a Laborite wrote in one of our northern papers asking in answer to my criticism, "Were they not deserving of such honor?" Where the "honor" comes in he did not explain; but Fisher's career shows where his personal interests came in, and the bogus Napoleon who succeeded him.

Then we have Hyndman, whose aristocratic connections makes it natural enough that he should have advocated a strong parva.

The late Keir Hardie, though admittedly sincere, had no knowledge of or belief in the class struggle, and stated he got his Socialism in the New Testament; and it looked like it, too, being highly administered and would be considered by any rational mental pure food regulation.

Although Ramsay MacDonald and Philip Snowden have done some good work in connection with the war, still a must be remembered that they almost oppose war because of the Socialist objection, that in no European country is there difference enough to justify the sacrifice of life by any working man in any one of the countries concerned; but because they believed British imperialism was at fault, and that King and Court were kept out of the struggle Mr. MacDonald, when chairman of the Labor Party, and with the consent of the Party, thus becoming its representative, was present at a luncheon given by the Secretary of State for War in honor of William H. of Germany, with the Kaiser, the Black Sheep of royalty in Europe. (Former Labor member associating with the Kaiser, Count Metternich, Admiral Muller, Lord Kitchener and others of the same stamp.)

Of course, MacDonald does not believe in the class struggle. He says the Labor Party "does not appeal to narrow class interests or prejudices." It is not surprising then that he backed up Sir John Brunner's Education (Amendments) Bill, reducing the age for leaving school to eleven years. In the same way Labor members from the factory towns, have supported the half time system because shortsighted laboring people in those districts were in favor of depriving their children of even the meagre advantage which public school education affords in England.

Snowden's ideas may be gauged when he urges special treatment, when wealthy women demanding votes for women possessing property, otherwise called suffragettes, are arrested for indulging in that form of physical culture called window smashing. They are "women of education and culture," he says, and must not be associated with the woman who purloins a loaf of bread. He also followed Judas Burns in defending the Asquith Government in shooting the miners at Featherstone. In the railway strike of 1912, the British Labor Party, did all that was possible, and succeeded admirably in securing the defeat of the strikers; and Fred. Henderson in his work, "The Labor Unrest," justly enough takes them to task for openly supporting the capitalist class. Witness their regard for capitalist interests as evidenced in a manifesto issued a few years ago by the Trade Union and Labor Officials' Temperance Fellowship, where it is stated the liquor traffic is an enemy of the working class movement, because "it lessens the industrial efficiency of the worker." "Some" economists those are, to be sure. It never occurred to them that greater efficiency, like speeding up, increases unemployment.

Mr. Lansbury, M.P., sums up the matter concisely when he said, "In the Labor Party a large number of the 42 members know nothing about Socialism. They have always thought about politics from the Liberal standpoint." This is exactly the position, and explains Mr. Snowden's statement that in no British constituency could a Labor member be elected if opposed by other parties. This is, in turn, explained by Mr. Masterman's article in the "Nation," 24th Aug., 1908, where he shows the Labor Party merely strengthens the Liberal Party. He says—"The accession of strength came with the realisation of the mildness of the Labor Party. There were no wild revolution-

